

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
2 United States Attorney
3 ARIN C. HEINZ
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
6 Fresno, CA 93721
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4080
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099
9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
11 United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. 1:24-CR-00069-NODJ-BAM

Plaintiff.

**STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
ORDER**

EDWIN ANGULO,

DATE: May 8, 2024

V.

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. B

CONTRIBUTOR: Barbara A. Mierschansky

BACKGROUND

This case is set for status conference on May 8, 2024. The Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; see also *United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or

1 finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of
2 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

3 In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding
4 excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7)
5 (Local Code T4). If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United*
6 *States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be
7 “specifically limited in time”).

8 **STIPULATION**

9 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and
10 through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

11 1. By previous order, this matter was set for a status conference on May 8, 2024.

12 2. By this stipulation, the defendant moves to continue the status conference to June 12,
13 2024, and exclude time between May 8, 2024 and June 12, 2024, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A),
14 B(iv) [Local Code T4].

15 3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

16 a) The government provided discovery to the defense on April 8, 2024. The discovery
17 consists of investigative reports, bodycam footage, photographs, and other information.
18 b) Counsel for the defendant desires additional time to consult with her client, review the
19 discovery, and conduct an independent investigation. Counsel for defendant believes that
20 failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time
21 necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
22 c) The Government plans to make a plea offer to the Defense. The parties have engaged in
23 discussions about the potential of a plea and how the guidelines will apply in this case.
24 The parties continue to confer about the potential of a plea.

25 d) After the Government makes the plea offer, the Defense counsel will need additional time
26 to review the plea, discuss it with her client, and engage in negotiations.

27 e) The government does not object to the continuance.

28 f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as

1 requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
2 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

3 g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq.,
4 within which trial must commence, the time period of April 24, 2024 until June 12, 2024,
5 inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code
6 T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on
7 the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action
8 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

9 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
10 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial
11 must commence.

12 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

13 Dated: April 29, 2024

14 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

15 _____
16 /s/ ARIN C. HEINZ
ARIN C. HEINZ
17 Assistant United States Attorney

18 Dated: April 29, 2024

19 _____
20 /s/ KARA OTTERVANGER
KARA OTTERVANGER
Counsel for Defendant
Edwin Angulo

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from May 8, 2024, to **June 12, 2024**, at **1:00 p.m.** in **Courtroom 8** before **Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. Time is excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 30, 2024

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE